



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of Lynchburg against it. From an order granting the application, the City of Lynchburg brings error. Affirmed.

N. C. Manson, Jr., of Lynchburg, for plaintiff in error.

S. V. Kemp and *John L. Lee*, both of Lynchburg, for defendant in error.

SICKEL *v.* COMMONWEALTH.

Jan. 16, 1919.

[97 S. E. 783.]

1. Intoxicating Liquors (§ 210*)—Offenses—Indictment.—An indictment in three counts, charging that defendant violated the prohibition law by bringing into the state of Virginia ardent spirits, held good.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 17 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 551.]

2. Indictment and Information (§ 121 (2)*)—Bill of Particulars.—Where an indictment charged that defendant violated the prohibition law, by bringing into the state of Virginia and city of Richmond on particular days ardent spirits, etc., held that indictment itself was sufficient to enable defendant to make out his defense, and the denial of defendant's motion for bill of particulars was not error.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 7 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 418; 17 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 551.]

3. Commerce (§ 14*)—Jurisdiction of State—Intoxicating Liquors.—The Reed-Jones Amendment, § 5 (U. S. Comp. St. 1918, §§ 8739a, 10387a-10387c), declaring that whoever shall cause intoxicating liquors to be transported in interstate commerce, except for certain purposes, into any state the laws of which prohibit the sale and manufacture of intoxicating liquors, shall be punished, did not deprive the state of Virginia of jurisdiction to prosecute one who brought intoxicating liquors into the state in violation of prohibition law, where the bringing of such liquor into the state was not shown to constitute interstate commerce.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 7 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 869; 17 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 548.]

Error to Hustings Court of Richmond.

Charles S. Sickel was convicted of violation of the prohibition law, and brings error. Affirmed.

G. K. Pollock and *D. H. Leake*, both of Richmond, for plaintiff in error.

The Attorney General, for the Commonwealth.

*For other cases see same topic and KEY-NUMBER in all Key-Numbered Digests and Indexes.